

REMARKS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Office Action dated 12 January 2006. Responsive to the objections and rejections made in the Office Action, Claims 1-3, 7, 8 and 10 have been amended to clarify the language thereof and/or the dependency thereof and/or clarify the combination of elements that form the invention of the Subject Patent Application. Claims 4, 5, and 8 have been cancelled by this Amendment.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to Claims 1, 2 and 9 due to informalities therein, and Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner stated that there was insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "the hollow stub." Accordingly, Claims 1, 2, and 9 have been amended to correct the language thereof. Claim 7 has been amended to provide the necessary antecedent basis for "the hollow stub" limitation. Therefore, it is now believed that the claims particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicant regards as the invention.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1 and 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as anticipated by Curtis et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,755,207. However, the Examiner kindly indicated that Claims 3 and 8-10 would be

allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and Claim 7 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of Claims 4 and 8 therein. Thus, Claim 8 has effectively been placed in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim, Claim 1, and the only intervening claim, Claim 4. Thus, Claim 1 and the claims dependant thereon should now be allowable. Claim 3 has been amended to place that claim in independent form by the addition of the limitations of original Claim 1 therein, and there being no intervening claims, should now also be allowable. Claim 7 is dependent on Claim 3 and includes further patently distinct subject matter, as kindly indicated by the Examiner.

MR1683-533
Serial Number: 10/800,745
Reply to Office Action dated 12 January 2006

For all the foregoing reasons, it is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
For: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "David I. Klein".

David I. Klein
Registration #33,253

Dated: *11 May 2006*

Suite 101
3458 Ellicott Center Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410) 465-6678
Customer No. 04586